



GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON HUMAN TRAFFICKING

MINUTES

Thursday, June 6th, 2013

9:30 AM

1700 W. Washington, Governor's 2nd Floor Conference Room

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

A public meeting of the Governor's Task Force on Human Trafficking was convened on June 6th, 2013 in the 2nd Floor Conference Room, 1700 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Notice having been duly given. Present and absent were the following members of the Task Force.

Members Present

Cindy McCain (Co-Chairperson, present via conference line)	Jim Gallagher
Gil Orrantia (Co-Chairperson)	Bill Montgomery
Lea Benson	Sheila Polk
Doug Coleman	Bill Ridenour
Adam Driggs	Brian Steele
Doug Ducey	Grant Woods

Members Absent

Larrie Fraley	Andrew Pacheco
Robert Halliday	

Staff Present

Jamie Bennett, Governor's Office
Lindsay Scornavacco, Governor's Office

1. Call to Order

Gil Orrantia welcomed everyone to the Governor's Task Force on Human Trafficking meeting. The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m. Mr. Orrantia thanked the Task Force members for their commitment to the Task Force and their input. He pointed out that Cindy McCain was participating in the meeting over the phone. Mrs. McCain apologized for not being able to physically attend the meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

Bill Montgomery moved that the meeting minutes from the May 15th meeting be approved. Sheila Polk seconded the motion. All present members voted aye.

3. Presentation from Local Law Enforcement

Mr. Orrantia introduced Lieutenant Jim Gallagher from the Phoenix Police Department (PPD). Lt. Gallagher expressed the purpose of his presentation was to provide the Task Force with a view from the street and practical recommendations with regard to human trafficking as it occurs in Arizona.

Specifically, Lt. Gallagher presented on the following:

- The evolution of human trafficking in Arizona;
- Trends that the PPD's Vice Unit is seeing;
- The investigative workload of the PPD;
- The lessons the PPD has learned; and,
- Recommendations for the Task Force.

Mr. Montgomery stated he did not agree with the existence of the statutory gap mentioned in Lt. Gallagher's presentation. He stated the Legislature intended to recognize children under 15 as a special population and believes it is a mischaracterization to describe that action as creating a gap for the 15 to 17 population. He commented that the case needs to be made for the need to look at addressing that specific population. Mr. Montgomery cautioned the Task Force against aligning state and federal law. He recognized they are separate sovereigns and have separate issues. Safe Harbor laws should address Arizona's needs.

Lt. Gallagher recognized the White Paper was created to encourage conversations around all possibilities in making Arizona better around sex trafficking issues.

Mr. Montgomery noted that the state cannot charge a felony on the basis of the number of arrests, but rather on the basis of convictions. He explained that after someone has been convicted for a prostitution misdemeanor for the third time they can be submitted for a class five felony offense. Mr. Montgomery stated he did not believe that it is a problem.

Mr. Montgomery noted that he, Mrs. Polk, and other county attorneys have lobbied the Legislature to change the diversion statute to allow for participation even with a prior felony conviction for prostitution. He committed to looking at diversion programs.

Mr. Montgomery suggested specifying child prostitution and sex trafficking when referring to the DNA collection recommendation presented by Lt. Gallagher. He highlighted A.R.S. § 13-610 (O)(3) as specifically referencing prostitution and the ability to collect DNA, but reminded members that with a recent Supreme Court ruling one must be able to characterize the act as a serious offense.

Mrs. Polk asked Lt. Gallagher to explain the age gap that he referenced in his presentation. Lt. Gallagher acknowledged that law enforcement must enforce what is currently in the Arizona Revised Statutes. He stated that the victim population that he works with is not often under 15 years old. For children under 15, the dangerous crimes against children statutes and the statute that allows for a class three felony dictate those cases. For youth ages 15 up to one day younger than 18 years old, the statutes provide for a class four or class five felony.

Lt. Gallagher explained that the position highlighted in the White Paper suggests being cautious of assigning a degree of victimization based on age. He stated that victims who are trafficked from a young age carry issues with them into adulthood; it affects their criminal capability and their need for victim's services. He reiterated the recommendation to consider opportunities for enhanced victim's services regardless of the victim's age. Lt. Gallagher also recommended a review of the statutes to reassess how the "Johns" are charged with consideration of whether they knew the victim was a juvenile.

Mrs. McCain reminded everyone that throughout the life of the Task Force they would hear from different perspectives and thought-processes. She iterated that the presenters and the discussions were not representative of the entire group, but rather that of the speaker. She encouraged the members to consider the perspectives of each of the other members and speakers, and to consider the best solutions for Arizona.

Bill Ridenour asked if there has been an evaluation of what usually happens after a fourth arrest, or after a third conviction. Mr. Montgomery responded that in speaking with the City of Phoenix's Prosecuting Office, individuals are being offered a diversion program after their third misdemeanor conviction. He stated that cases that are referred to his office for a felony review will be offered a diversion program.

Mr. Montgomery also stated that since the diversion statute was changed last year, cases that have a first felony conviction for prostitution, if they are submitted again, are going to get another chance at diversion. He suggested that the only assessment that is needed is whether an individual would pursue a diversion program on the first felony submittal to avoid a felony conviction, and whether they would take advantage of it a second time around.

Lt. Gallagher explained that when an individual is arrested for the third time in the City of Phoenix they are typically not eligible for diversion. He stated that individuals are offered diversion as a condition of their arrest in the court process after the first time. The eligibility requirements for diversion state that an individual cannot have completed a diversion program or been offered a diversion program before. Therefore, once an individual is arrested for the third time it is not an option.

Lt. Gallagher said that from a personal perspective he believes the victims should not have the threat of a felony charge hanging over the heads when they are forced to go back out on the streets, which results in law enforcement contact. He suggested that the state should no more criminalize human trafficking victims to the felony degree than the state should any other ongoing victim for something else.

Lt. Gallagher asked Mr. Montgomery if any of the 12 cases that PPD referred to the Maricopa County Attorney's Office in the past year were for felony prosecution. Mr. Montgomery indicated he was not aware of which agency the referrals came from, but stated his office charged 12 of the 17 cases his office was referred from the past year. He indicated he would find out which agency referred the cases.

Mr. Montgomery iterated the importance of the number of convictions as opposed to the number of arrests. He gave the example of someone getting arrested 10 times. If a prosecutor is not able to make a case for any of the arrests, they would be treated as a first offender for misdemeanor purposes.

Mrs. Polk inquired about the ability to collect DNA. Lt. Gallagher explained that as he understands it, the City of Phoenix does not ask the Sheriff's office to collect and retain that information, but sometimes the Sheriff's Office does for their own purposes.

Mrs. Polk asked Lt. Gallagher to clarify in which circumstances he was referring to collecting DNA. Lt. Gallagher confirmed that DNA is collected in cases involving children under 18 and in sex crime cases. The recommendation he discussed is in reference to the traffickers and “Johns”, when the case does not involve sex crimes with the girl arrested for prostitution. He explained that the idea behind obtaining and retaining the trafficker’s DNA is they are often involved in other criminal offenses and they may be involved in sex crime cases. Mr. Orrantia thanked Lt. Gallagher for his presentation.

4. Presentation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Mr. Orrantia introduced Special Agents Jim Egelston and Ryan Blay from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Mr. Blay presented an overview of human trafficking, the FBI’s response, the mission of the Child Exploitation Task Force, and the FBI’s Phoenix Human Trafficking partnerships.

Grant Woods thanked Mr. Blay for his presentation and work on the issue. He acknowledged the whole point of anti-trafficking efforts is to get Phoenix off the list of highest trafficked cities in the United States. Mr. Woods asked Mr. Blay if he believed doing so was possible. Mr. Blay acknowledged that Phoenix is headed in the right direction and local anti-trafficking efforts are working.

Mr. Woods asked Mr. Blay for a recommendation of what the Task Force should address. Mr. Blay suggested federal, state, and local coordination. He stated that the U.S. Attorney’s Office is continually working to strengthen that coordination.

Mr. Woods asked whether government, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) or Child Protective Services (CPS) can address victim’s issues better than non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Mr. Blay stated he believes the DES/CPS have limited resources and can’t address the issue on their own. Mr. Woods asked Mr. Blay what he believes works better: government involvement or an NGO response. Mr. Blay acknowledged the using DES/CPS for services is an option.

Mr. Woods recognized the importance of the first amendment, but highlighted his concern over Backpage. He informed the members that the owner of Backpage is from Arizona. Mr. Woods asked Mr. Blay if the FBI or the Department of Justice have any recommendations for addressing sites like Backpage. Mr. Blay stated he could facilitate a conversation around that issue.

Mr. Montgomery inquired as to how the FBI considers evidence in determining whether a perpetrator knew the victim was under 18. Mr. Blay stated the FBI does not make final determinations on evidence; they collect as much evidence as possible for the U.S. Attorney’s Office.

Mrs. Polk asked about what happens to victims who are illegal immigrants. Mr. Blay deferred to Matt Allen, who was present representing ICE. Mr. Orrantia thanked Mr. Blay for his presentation.

5. Presentation from the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Mr. Orrantia introduced Special Agent in Charge Matt Allen from the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Mr. Allen expressed ICE Homeland Security Investigation's (HSI) commitment to combating human trafficking. He shared information on the Department of Homeland Security's Blue Campaign, which serves as the Department's unified voice for combating human trafficking. He handed out some materials from the Blue Campaign and encouraged members to visit the Campaign's website at: www.dhs.gov/bluecampaign.

Mr. Allen explained that HSI focuses primarily on trafficking situations that involve foreign nationals who have become trafficking victims and the transnational criminal organizations that traffic them, both in the United States and throughout the world. Many of the sex trafficking investigations involve U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents who travel internationally to engage in sex with minors.

Mr. Allen stated that federal law makes it a violation to obtain labor or commercial sex through force, fraud or coercion. In the case of minors, the force, fraud or coercion elements are not required. Many of the HSI sex trafficking investigations that focus on minors also rely on the Mann Act, codified under Title 18 of the United States Code between sections 2421 and 2424.

Mr. Allen said in Fiscal Year 2012 HSI initiated 894 human trafficking investigations worldwide, made 967 arrests and obtained 559 indictments and 381 convictions in human trafficking investigations. He explained that was a dramatic increase over 2010 when HSI initiated 651 investigations, made 300 arrests and obtained 151 indictments and 144 convictions.

Mr. Allen provided members with a copy of a federal indictment that was obtained in an Arizona-based human trafficking investigation that HSI conducted jointly with the FBI and which is pending in U.S. District Court. While he couldn't discuss the specifics of the investigation because it has not been fully adjudicated, he indicated the indictment demonstrates how federal human trafficking cases work, that it can happen anywhere and often happens in plain sight.

Mr. Allen explained that one of the challenges HSI often encounters when talking about human trafficking investigations is the vocabulary around the issue. He stated the words "smuggling" and "trafficking" are often used interchangeably without an understanding that they are very unique crimes. Within HSI, they train agents, victim/witness specialists and the public that human smuggling is a transportation crime in which the "victim" is the United States, whereas human trafficking is a crime of exploitation in which the victim is a person.

Mr. Allen said that trafficking is a crime that does not discriminate between who can be a victim and who can't. Trafficking victims can be men, women, children, U.S. citizens or foreigners, regardless of their immigration status. He explained that human trafficking is ultimately driven by two primary motives – money and power. Human traffickers identify, recruit and exploit their victims by preying on their most basic human needs, among them food, shelter and love. With this in mind, HSI has examined their previous human trafficking investigations and have drawn some very broad generalizations about they have seen in their cases. Specifically: more U.S. citizens, both adults and children, are found in sex trafficking situations than in labor trafficking situations; and, more foreign born victims are found in labor trafficking situations than sex trafficking.

Mr. Allen shared that over the past three years the primary countries of origin for victims certified by the U.S. government as human trafficking victims were Thailand, Mexico, Philippines, Haiti, India, Guatemala, China, Korea and the Dominican Republic. He acknowledged that human trafficking investigations are some of the most complex and challenging investigations conducted by HSI and the complexity is often compounded by the fact that the victims are often foreign born.

Mr. Allen expressed that one of the most significant challenges HSI faces is getting human trafficking victims, regardless of the type of trafficking or the victims' immigration status, to come forward. The fear, shame and humiliation that victims experience from trafficking make it a very underreported crime. He explained that the comparison that is often made is that human trafficking is where domestic violence was 20 years ago in terms of its underreporting. Many of the investigative and prosecutorial challenges faced in domestic violence cases, like reluctant or conflicted victims, are very similar to the challenges faced in human trafficking investigations. From an investigator and prosecutor's perspective, the victim in a human trafficking case is also the "evidence." Without the evidence, it is very difficult to conduct a successful investigation or prosecution.

Mr. Allen went on to say that one of the key things that traffickers prey on with respect to foreign born victims is their fear of arrest by DHS and removal from the United States to their home countries. The fear of removal from the U.S. is a significant concern for trafficking victims since they fear that returning them to their home countries will only serve to put them back into the very same environment where their trafficking nightmare began. In order to overcome this challenge, HSI often has to work through "surrogates" like NGO's or advocacy groups to interview potential victims in a non-law enforcement setting in order to allay their fears that the involvement of HSI or another DHS component means that they are on a fast track to removal and re-victimization.

Another challenge Mr. Allen described is often facing what he referred to as the "cultural divide." Many trafficking victims, whether trafficked in a sex or labor setting, come from cultures where workers rights or reproductive rights and values are not the same as the United States. The challenge HSI faces in those situations is that the victims often don't see themselves as victims like HSI does. He stated that working with surrogates like NGO's and advocacy groups is important to bridging the divide.

Mr. Allen shared that the HSI human trafficking investigative strategy is multifaceted, but it relies primarily on three main pillars as its core:

1. Victim identification, rescue, recovery and restitution;
2. Criminal arrest and prosecution of traffickers; and,
3. Education and outreach.

Mr. Allen stated HSI has the ability to grant short term immigration relief through "Continued Presence" status to trafficking victims. Continued Presence status can be granted for a year at a time and makes a victim eligible for work authorization. Longer term relief can be obtained through a "T" visa, often referred to as a "Trafficking" visa. Trafficking victims can petition to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a T Visa after getting a certification from law enforcement that they have assisted in investigations and prosecutions. Approval of a T Visa puts a trafficking victim on a pathway to eventual citizenship. He pointed out that although Congress established an annual cap of 5,000 T Visas every year, the cap has never been hit.

Mr. Allen informed the Task Force that another form of long term immigration relief is the “U” visa. It provides a lawful immigration status for victims of certain specified crimes. HSI provides training to investigators and executives from other law enforcement agencies about the Continued Presence, T Visa, U Visa and other HSI tools that are available to them in their investigations.

Through enhanced funding from Congress, HSI has hired professional victim/witness specialists and specially trained forensic interview specialists to support human trafficking and child exploitation cases. Professional victim/witness specialists and forensic interviewers bring a wealth of knowledge and specialized training to the table that allows their case agents to focus on furthering their criminal investigation while the victim/witness specialists and interviewers focus on insuring that the victims’ rights are preserved and they get connected to the service providers and advocates that they need to heal. The professionals also help to overcome the victims’ concern of being removed from the U.S.

Brian Steele asked what the criteria are for the continued presence status and for U Visas. Mr. Allen explained that HSI can grant continued presence status administratively and there is a process for U Visas in which law enforcement, prosecution, or judges must sign for the application.

Lea Benson inquired about training for first responders, specifically as it relates to child welfare victims. Mr. Allen shared that training for first responders is happening. He referenced a recent case in Tucson where HSI provided training for CPS. He iterated the need to continue those trainings.

Mrs. Benson explained that most of the girls at StreetLightUSA do not want to be there. She talked about the perception of coercion when they are trying to keep the girls in treatment. Mr. Allen suggested that most of the victims do not see themselves as victims. He explained that often they have fallen in love with their pimp. He suggested that law enforcement, NGOs, and providers need to help victims recognize that they are victims.

Mr. Allen added to a previous question that was discussed about what can be done to address human trafficking. He emphasized the need to recognize the issue and to establish greater partnerships within the community to make it socially unacceptable.

Doug Ducey asked what the meaning behind the name for the “Blue Campaign” was. He iterated the difficulty with addressing human trafficking is the general lack of public awareness around the issue. He suggested that having clearer ways to identify the issue would be helpful.

Mrs. Polk asked whether the T Visas and U Visas apply across the board to all criminal investigations and prosecutions, who approves the visas, how long of an approval process is it, and what the status is of the victims while those visa applications are processed. Mr. Allen shared that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services has the ultimate approval and the process generally takes anywhere from three to nine months once certification has been obtained. Once an application has been submitted, the individual would receive a receipt of their application submittal and would not be removed in the meantime.

Mrs. McCain asked Mr. Allen if there is enough cross-agency information sharing around human trafficking cases. Mr. Allen stated that most law enforcement agencies share information regularly and communicate well. He suggested the need to strengthen the identification of victims and to encourage victims to come forward, particularly among labor trafficking victims.

Mr. Orrantia inquired about how much training is occurring within ICE around human trafficking issues. Mr. Allen shared that training is ongoing and occurs frequently. Mr. Orrantia thanked Mr. Allen for his presentation.

6. Short Break

Mr. Orrantia recessed the Task Force meeting for a ten minute break from 11:00 to 11:10 a.m.

7. Presentation from the Arizona Peace Officer Standards & Training Board

Mr. Orrantia introduced Commander Don Yennie from the Arizona Peace Officer and Standards Training Board (AZ POST). Commander Yennie shared the history of AZ POST's training around human trafficking, which began in 2005. He explained that while there is no topic within the basic law enforcement training for all officers that is explicitly entitled "human trafficking", there are about 10 categories of related issues that are covered. The training covers kidnapping, assault, prostitution, family offenses, and others.

Commander Yennie provided members with a brief overview of the hand-outs he had for them. He provided members with some examples of training materials that AZ POST uses. He also highlighted the in-service and calendar training classes that are available statewide that are specific to human trafficking. He stated that the trainings include scenario-based instruction and are available to civilians.

Commander Yennie acknowledged that while most of the videos are fairly lengthy and are not accommodating to roll calls or briefings for law enforcement, there are very short videos available that are accommodating for quick training opportunities. He also shared that AZ POST will be releasing e-learning opportunities in the near future and they will continue to work collaboratively with California POST on developing a new training series, this will be available in the Fall of 2013. Commander Yennie indicated that AZ POST would welcome recommendations from the Task Force for additional law enforcement training.

Mrs. McCain asked if any of the training material would be applicable for civilian use, specifically for the airlines or for hotels. Commander Yennie indicated that the training is easily adaptable to educate the public.

Mrs. Benson noted the availability of many awareness campaigns. She asked how a campaign should be selected. Commander Yennie agreed that there are a lot of campaigns available, but suggested that they are often tailored to specific audiences. He noted the need to make sure the training is applicable to audience – where they work or their work assignment, or just general information as well. He affirmed that first responders are not as educated as they need to be because of competing priorities and assignments. Mrs. Benson inquired about the focus on identifying victims in the training, to which Commander Yennie confirmed was essential.

Lt. Gallagher asked Commander Yennie to speak to the field identification card that is provided to law enforcement. Commander Yennie reviewed the card, citing indicators law enforcement are encouraged to look for and questions they should ask.

Mr. Orrantia asked how human trafficking issues are reinforced in training when they are not explicitly referred to as “sex trafficking” or “labor trafficking”. Commander Yennie explained he hoped the Task Force would be able to recommend ways to do that. He shared that in-service training is not mandatory; the trainings on human trafficking are available but are not required. He said that if the Task Force were to recommend the training be incorporated into the basic training, it would be.

Mrs. McCain asked if Commander Yennie thought it should be part of the required training. Commander Yennie was cautious not to speak on behalf of the Director of AZ POST, but acknowledged that all first responders should be aware of and trained in human trafficking issues. Mr. Orrantia thanked Commander Yennie for his presentation.

8. Presentation on Prosecution

Mr. Orrantia introduced Grant Woods, Former Arizona Attorney General. Mr. Woods thanked the Chairs and prefaced his presentation by explaining that he does not represent all the prosecutors on the Task Force, but rather he just wanted to share his own perspective.

Mr. Woods shared that a lot of progress has been made in Arizona. He acknowledged the efforts of Lt. Gallagher and the PPD, the County Attorney, the federal government, and DHS. Mr. Woods stated that although there has been progress, everything is not okay. There is still a lot of work to do.

Mr. Woods described four areas that he believes the Task Force should take action. First, is looking at the criminal justice system. Specifically, Mr. Woods recommended a change to the distinction between victims between the ages of 15, 16, and 17. He iterated the uniqueness of the crime of human trafficking. The fact that “Johns” are tried differently on the basis of whether they *thought* the victim was 18, he suggested is preposterous.

Mr. Woods proposed a zero tolerance of the crime – he suggested that it should not matter what a perpetrator *thought* the victim’s age was. Mr. Woods expressed concern over how “Johns” are perceived and prosecuted. He suggested that anyone who pays to have sex with a minor should be locked up for a significant period of time.

Mr. Woods also addressed Safe Harbor law. He proposed the criminal justice system should be restructured in a way that treats underage victims like true victims – from training all the way up. He suggested that the State should have the ability to charge them with a crime in order to force their participation in a diversion program. Mr. Woods also advocated a review of Proposition 200 as it relates to how drug offenders are treated in Arizona. He also agreed with the sentiment that if an individual continues to return to the offense after several failed attempts at diversion, they should be locked up. Mr. Woods stated he believes Safe Harbor law is complex and deserves careful consideration.

Second, Mr. Woods described a frustration with Backpage and its origin in Arizona. He suggested the Task Force address the prevalence of trafficking through Backpage. He acknowledged first amendment concerns around prosecuting an entity like Backpage, but suggested there may be a way to address the issue. Mr. Woods explained that Backpage is the number one vehicle for child prostitution in the United States and is under the ownership of someone in Arizona. He suggested that as the Governor of Arizona's Task Force, the group should be the one to at least try to address Backpage. He urged the involvement of the federal government in providing direction.

Third, Mr. Woods asked the members to consider a holistic approach to anti-trafficking efforts. He advised members to avoid limiting their recommendations based on resource concerns. He stated the Task Force was charged with recommending the best possible plan for the State. He explained the Task Force should consider resource needs for all jurisdictions, including local law enforcement and the county attorneys.

Mr. Woods also suggested the Task Force consider DES/CPS' role in the issue. He requested the Chairs ask the Governor to have DES/CPS present to the Task Force on how the child welfare system responds to the issue. He stated it is unfair to suggest that NGOs should handle the issue on their own.

Fourth, Mr. Woods recommended the Task Force look at what the State can do to better educate the public on human trafficking. He suggested the members should consider how to better publicize the problem, strengthen training for law enforcement, enhance victim's assistance, and raise awareness that Arizona will not tolerate human trafficking.

Senator Adam Driggs asked Mr. Woods for his opinion on how to address mens rea in the state laws. He talked about the difference between attempting to solicit prostitution, soliciting prostitution, and committing the act. He pointed out that the current prostitution statutes are unique because an attempt carries the same penalty as carrying out the actual act.

Mr. Woods agreed with Senator Driggs and suggested the Task Force look at amending those sections of statute. He stated that he believes the actus reus standard should be imposed in prostitution cases when involving a minor. Mr. Woods shared an example of recent child pornography cases where individuals received prison sentences exceeding 100 years for each piece of pornography they viewed. When asked by the media whether those sentences were too harsh, Mr. Woods defended the severity of the sentencing. He urged harsh penalties for sex trafficking involving minors in an effort to eliminate the demand for those services. Mr. Woods agreed that a normal delineation between attempts, solicitations, and actually committing the act would be something to consider.

Mr. Montgomery affirmed that the way prostitution is defined in Arizona encompasses both the offer and the actual offense. He went on to acknowledge the problem and prevalence with child pornography and other related sexual misconduct crimes involving minors. He stated that in order to get rid of a market, one must deny availability to the product, punish those that try and provide the product, and punish those that try and use the product.

Mr. Montgomery shared that Arizona has been successful in minimizing the market for child pornography within the State in recent years. He suggested that should be the goal for child prostitution and sex trafficking as well. Mr. Montgomery said an argument could be made that the State is trying to deny a market for those crimes; he suggested sharing the information with members of the Legislature.

Bill Ridenour asked about the role of NGOs and the private sector. He wondered if the Task Force should consider their contributions and how to support their work. Mr. Woods suggested that CPS ought to be playing a bigger role in addressing the issue. He indicated interest in hearing from CPS.

Mrs. Benson stressed the importance of the statutes. She talked about the need for consequences and the ability to keep the girls she serves at StreetLightUSA from running away. She shared that she can only do so much. For example, the FBI has given her metal detectors but she cannot use them because she does not have reasonable cause. Mrs. Benson also recommended the Task Force consider resource needs.

Mr. Woods iterated the uniqueness of the issue and the victim's participation in the crime. He affirmed his belief that the individuals affected are truly victims. However, he suggested the need to have consequences for victims who choose not to participate in diversion programs. He likened the problem to drug cases; there must be opportunities for rehabilitation, but if they continually refuse treatment and assistance they need to be prosecuted. Mr. Orrantia asked whether the current system provides those opportunities to encourage participation in diversion programs. Mr. Woods indicated there are, but there is an opportunity to review the statutes and strengthen those provisions.

Mrs. McCain and Mr. Orrantia thanked Mr. Woods for his presentation.

9. Discussion

Mr. Orrantia asked for input from the members on things they heard about in the last two meetings. Representative Doug Coleman affirmed the need to require information on a national victim's assistance hotline be posted in public areas like truck stops and hotels.

Mr. Montgomery suggested a statewide hotline, like the CPS hotline. He also highlighted the necessity of distinguishing between perpetrators of prostitution and victims. Specifically as it relates to the use of diversion programs. Mr. Orrantia recognized the need to assess each case individually.

Lt. Gallagher shared some of his main take-aways from the meeting. First, he indicated a need to try and minimize "pushing" the issues out of Maricopa County and into other jurisdictions. Second, the need to incorporate a greater multi-disciplinary and community response to trafficking cases – and to recognize their contributions. Finally, he described intent to continue providing training statewide.

Mrs. Polk stressed the importance of a public awareness campaign. She suggested the campaign must be multifaceted and recommended the Task Force consider specifics – what should a campaign look like and how it can be funded. Mrs. Polk shared a brief story about traveling to Costa Rica with her family. There were large signs in the airport that made it very clear that it was not okay to engage in child prostitution in that country.

Mrs. Polk also expressed an interest in hearing more about the role of money laundering in smuggling and trafficking. Mr. Orrantia encouraged members to visit <http://www.swballiance.org/> for more information.

Mr. Ducey recognized the need to create a culture shift around trafficking issues. He highlighted previous culture shifts around drunk driving and domestic violence. Mr. Ducey suggested that once they are presented with a public awareness campaign, the public will instinctively see the issue as wrong and rally against it.

Mr. Ridenour shared how encouraged he was to hear about the collaboration going on between NGOs and government. He suggested the Task Force consider additional opportunities for those partnerships and for additional resources. Mr. Ridenour asked to hear from the provider community at future meetings.

Mrs. Benson asked for an assessment of CPS statutes and stressed the difficulty providers have in helping children within the child welfare system. She also indicated a need to better identify and assist the kids affected by trafficking.

Mr. Orrantia requested that Mrs. Benson share specific information on issues she has encountered with CPS at a future meeting.

Mrs. McCain suggested that the Task Force consider recommendations that are broad enough to encompass the entire State and not just Maricopa County.

10. Call to the Public

Mr. Orrantia introduced Katie Resendez. Mrs. Resendez explained the Blue Campaign and the significance behind the name. Mrs. Resendez indicated a need for a statewide awareness campaign. She recognized the importance of NGOs around anti-trafficking efforts and encouraged the Task Force to give NGOs a stronger voice.

11. Closing Statements/Announce Next Meeting

Mrs. McCain announced the Mrs. Benson offered to provide members with a tour of StreetlightUSA and a tour has been scheduled for July 2nd. She encouraged members to attend. She thanked everyone for their involvement and engagement in the meeting and in anti-trafficking efforts at large, as well as for their time.

Mr. Orrantia echoed Mrs. McCain's comments and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He reminded everyone that the next meeting is scheduled for August 14th at 9:30 a.m. in the same room. All meeting materials are available on the Task Force website.

12. Adjournment

Mr. Orrantia adjourned the meeting at 12:16 p.m.